APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,262	10/10/2000	John T. Wassom JR.	06975-029004	3601

26171   7590   07/25/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/582,262	WASSOM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to amendment, filed 05/09/2005.

2.   Claims 1-50 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 28, 42, and 44 are independent

claims. In this amendment, no claim is canceled, claims 1, 42, and 44 are amended, and no claim

is added. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-35, and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bodnar (US 6,544,295).

As per independent claim 1, Bodnar teaches a method of managing navigation

information in a computer application, the method comprising:

establishing a global context that can communicate with a plurality of resources (col. 6,

line 60 – col. 7, line 8), each resource residing in an associated local context (browsing the

Internet Browser using different URLs);

communicating state information from one or more of the local contexts to the global

context (browsing the Internet Browser using different URLs); and

maintaining global navigation information for the plurality of resources using a single

navigation interface based on the communicated state information, wherein the plurality of

resources are separate and independent resources (col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8 and col. 7, lines

35-51) that include both browser and non-browser applications (col. 7, lines 47-51 and col. 9,

lines 5-11); and

presenting the global navigation information as an ordered list of the resources

representative of an order in which the resources were accessed using the single navigation

interface (fig. 7 is an global navigation information shows an ordered list of the resources

representative of an order in which the resources were accessed using the single navigation

interface).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches the communication of

state information occurs in response to a change in state in one or more of the local contexts (col.

7, lines 43-51).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Bodnar teaches the change in state in a

local context comprises a change in a title associated with a resource or a change in an address

associated with the resource, or both (col. 7, lines 43-51).

As per claims 4 and 5, which are dependent on claims 2 and 4 respectively, since

Bodnar's system is an Internet Browser (col. 7, lines 3-4), it is inherent that the change in state in

a local context is triggered by input from a user of the computer application in which the user's

triggering input comprises clicking on a Back/Forward navigation button, selecting an address

from a displayed history list, or typing an address in an address field.

As per claims 6 and 7, which are dependent on claims 2 and 6 respectively, since

Bodnar's system is an Internet Browser (col. 7, lines 3-4), it is inherent that the change in state in

a local context is triggered by a computer process transparently to a computer user in which the

transparent triggering comprises a title change notification from a host computer.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Since Bodnar's system is an Internet

Browser (col. 7, lines 3-4), it is inherent that the global navigation information comprises state

information for global-context Back/Forward buttons displayed in a graphical user interface

associated with the computer application.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches the global navigation

information comprises state information for a global-context history list presented to a user of the

computer application (fig. 7).

As per claims 10 and 11, which are dependent on claims 1 and 10 respectively, Bodnar

teaches receiving navigation input from a user of the computer application; and changing a focus

to move among the resources based on the received navigation input and the global navigation

information in which changing the focus comprises activating a window associated with a

resource (col. 7, lines 43-47).

As per claims 12 and 13, which are dependent on claims 1 and 12 respectively, Bodnar

teaches maintenance of the global navigation information comprises selectively modifying the

global navigation information depending on a manner in which a user interacts with the

computer application, which comprises one or more of clicking a cursor in a window associated

with a resource, clicking on a link in a window associated with a resource, clicking on a

Back/Forward navigation button, selecting an address from a displayed history list, or typing an

address in an address field (doing these interactions do not modify the bookmark history list).

As per claims 14 and 15, which are dependent on claims 1 and 14 respectively, Since

Bodnar's system is an Internet Browser, it is inherent that maintenance of the global navigation

information comprises pruning a navigation tree, in which pruning the navigation tree comprises:

determining that a user of the computer application is accessing a new address; and deleting

forward button state information.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches changing focus from a

current window to a previously accessed window based on the global navigation information

(col. 7, lines 43-47).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Bodnar teaches if a window associated

with the previously accessed address has been closed, spawning a new instance of that window

(col. 7, lines 3-4).

As per claims 18 and 19, which are dependent on claims 16 and 18 respectively, Bodnar teaches changing focus from a current window to a previously accessed window comprises using local-context navigation information maintained by a resource when navigating within that resource's local context, in which the resource maintaining local-context navigation information comprises a browser application (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Bodnar's system that a user can specify whether closing a window associated with a resource results in deletion of the window from the global navigation information.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Bodnar's system that maintenance of the global navigation information comprises deleting navigation information corresponding to a closed window.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches one or more of the resources comprises a browser application (col. 13, lines 65-66).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches one or more of the resources comprises a nonbrowser application (col. 13, lines 65-66).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches the computer application comprises online service client software (*Internet Browser*, col. 6, line 60 – col. 7, line 8).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches the global navigation information comprises a navigation path to move among resources (fig. 7).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches in which the communicated state information comprises a Uniform Resource Locator address (col. 13, lines 65-66).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 1, Bodnar teaches the communicated state information comprises a non-internet network address (col. 13, lines 65-66).

As per independent claim 28, Bodnar teaches a method of managing a history list in a computer application, the method comprising:

receiving state information from a plurality of independent and separate resources that include both browser and non-browser applications, each resource residing in an associated local context (browsing the Internet Browser using different URLs; col. 10, line 62 - col. 11, line 4, col. 7, lines 47-51 and col. 9, lines 5-11);

based on the received state information, maintaining a history of resources accessed by a user of the computer application; and presenting a global-context history list representative of an

order in which the resources were accessed using a single navigation interface (fig. 7; col. 10,

line 62 - col. 11, line 4).

As per claims 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Bodnar teaches enabling a user of the

computer application to return to any of the listed resources by selecting a desired resource from

the global-context history list (col. 9, lines 20-22).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 28 in which a resource communicates state

information in response to a change in state in the resource's local context (col. 9, lines 20-22).

As per claims 31 and 32, which are both dependent on claim 30, it is inherent in Bodnar's

system that the change in state in the resource's local context comprises a change in an address

associated with that resource and in which the change in state in the resource's local context

comprises a change in a title associated with that resource.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 28, Bodnar teaches the global-context

history list presented to the user selectively omits an identity of one or more of the accessed

resources (col. 10, line 62 – col. 11, line 4).

As per claims 34 and 35, which are dependent on claims 28 and 34 respectively, they are

rejected under the same rationale as claims 12 and 13 respectively.

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 28, it is inherent in Bodnar's system that maintenance of the history comprises adding a new entry to a top of a list if the resource had not been accessed previously.

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 28, Bodnar teaches maintenance of the history comprises rearranging entries in a list if the resource had been accessed previously (clicking on *Name, Updated, or Type* in fig. 7 would prompt the history list to be rearranged).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 28, Bodnar teaches the history of resources corresponds to a navigation path among resources (fig. 7).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 28, Bodnar teaches the state information received from a resource comprises a Uniform Resource Locator address (col. 13, lines 65-66).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 28, Bodnar teaches the state information received from a resource comprises a non-internet network address (col. 13, lines 65-66).

As per independent claims 42 and 44, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 43, which is dependent on 42, Bodnar teaches graphical controls that enable

a user of an application to move among resources based on the global-context navigation

information (fig. 9A and 9B).

As per claims 45 and 46, which are dependent on claims 44 and 45 respectively, they are

rejected under the same rationale as claim 43.

As per claims 47-50, Bodnar teaches the browser applications include web browser

applications and non-browser applications include word processing applications (col. 5, lines 48-

52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 28, the Examiner take Official Notice that

it is well known to display presentation of the global-context history list in a drop-down list. It

would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify Bodnar's system to

include a drop-down list displaying presentation of the global-context history since it would

conserve the window space.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 05/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argued that Bodnar fails to describe or suggest that the global navigation

information is presented as an ordered list of the resources representative of an order in which

the resources were accessed using the single navigation interface.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons. Fig. 7 is clearly global navigation

information that presents a history list of the resources accessed by a user and this list is ordered

by date and time.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Inquiries

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-

4139. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571)272-4136. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
July 20, 2005

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER